

Concordia University

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on December 5, 1986

Present: C. Bertrand, Chairperson; L. Bonin, Secretary;
 F. Whyte; C. Foster; J. Princz, D. Dicks;
 G. Valaskakis; M Anvari; T. Arbuckle-Maag; G. Auchinachie;
 M. Barlow; C. Barton; R. Cronin, s.j.; L. Crysler;
 G. Decarie; G. Dewey; M. Doughty; S. Dubas, s.j.;
 W. Gilsdorf; W. Hooper; W. Knitter; J. Locke; J. McGraw;
 H. McQueen; D. Markiewicz; K. Mukherji; F. Muller;
 S. Mullett; G. Newsham; R. Pallen; E. Preston; H. Proppe;
 J. Ryan; W. Sellers; D. Shapiro; G. Trudel; L. Van Toch;
 M. Verthuy; D. Jean; S. Maguire; S. O'Hara; A. Macpherson;
 L-J Regimbal; S. Robertson; I. Sideco.

Absent with regrets:

F. Shlosser; M. Oppenheim; H. Shulman.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:40 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

86-10-1 It was moved and seconded (Trudel/Robertson) to
 approve the agenda. Vote: Carried.

3. Approval of Minutes

86-10-2 It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Mukherji) to approve
 the Minutes of November 7, 1986. Two corrections were
 made (p.2, bottom line): change "did not seem" to "seem to
 have been". W. Knitter was inadvertently omitted from the
 list of those present. Vote: Carried.

4. Chairperson's Remarks

Dr. Bertrand alerted Council that a call for nominations
 had been sent as it was necessary to replace J. Hill on
 the Board of Governors for the remainder of his term.
 J. Hill would become the Resident Director of the Shastri
 Institute in New Delhi. Ballots would be sent in January.

C. Bertrand mentioned that support staff were finally receiving a much deserved retroactive salary increase of about 5%, and that faculty would receive a salary increase of 3%, also retroactive.

5. Questions and Announcements

It was asked if E. Morey, Advisor to the Rector on the Status of Women, could be invited to Council. The Dean said that he would invite her.

The Dean was asked to explain his request for a teaching dossier. He replied that his memo to departments had been sent June 23, 1986, and that his request was primarily to help the departmental personnel advisory committees (PAC's) assess performance review, contract renewals, and promotions. He remarked that CUFA seemed, at least partially, to endorse the idea, since their last newsletter suggested that more than student evaluations be used in judging the effectiveness of teaching. There are two problems with the exclusive use of student evaluations: 1) they are not mandatory under the Collective Agreement, 2) when used alone, a number of criticisms have been raised. He said that he had read the CAUT Guidelines on Preparing a Teaching Dossier and had spoken to the Director of the Learning Development Centre. The idea was that faculty would put together a package, submitting what they wished to the PACs. The dossiers would remain with the departments but the Deans Advisory Committee might wish to see some of them, particularly with regard to promotions. He noted that the University Committee on Promotions to Professor is now requesting a full dossier. This was done, he said, in the spirit of trying to evaluate teaching as effectively as possible and to give weight to our statements that we care about teaching.

The Dean was asked if 1) there was a faculty research appointment category not covered by the Collective Agreement, 2) whether or not this category had teaching duties, and 3) if he and the Vice-Rector had given approval to a research assistant professorship to someone in Geology in disregard of the will of the Geology faculty and their expressed priorities and research needs.

The Dean replied that there was a category known as Research Professor and that teaching duties may or may not be assigned. Where teaching duties were assigned, the appointment came under the Collective Agreement (e.g. University Research Fellows through NSERC). He said that he had recommended, and the Vice Rector had approved and issued an offer of appointment for a Visiting Research

Scholar in Geology, without teaching duties, for eighteen months. He said that there was a difference of opinion over the appointment in the Geology Department but that some members did support the appointment. He felt that some difficulties had revolved around the fact that the person appointed might teach and that opposition had possibly decreased.

6. Notice of Election

The Dean asked that nominations for the positions be sent to his office.

7. Appointments to Committees

a) Appointment of undergraduate and graduate student member to Arts and Science Advisory Committee on Computers
Undergraduate: Dominic Jean
Graduate: TBA

86-10-3 It was moved and seconded (Gilsdorf/Robertson) that Council ratify the appointment of Dominic Jean.
Vote: Carried.

b) Appointment of faculty member to Senate Computer Resources Committee.

It was recalled that Council had said that under normal circumstances the member should come from the Arts and Science Advisory Committee on Computers.

This Committee would first meet on December 18 and select, at that time, a representative to Senate. Council is to ratify the selection at the February meeting.

8. PT representation on Council

A Resolution from Steering Committee was distributed.

The Dean noted that Council, on 12 September 1986, in approving two seats for part-time faculty members, had also approved that the election be managed by CUPFA. Senate, however, had taken issue with the election procedure. The matter went to the Board of Governors, was tabled, and was returned to Council for a decision on how it wished to proceed. Steering Committee therefore consulted with S. Murray, Acting President of CUPFA, and revised part B of the Resolution so that the election would, in fact, be managed by Council.

86-10-4 It was moved and seconded (Proppe/Pallen) to accept a

revised section B as part of the Resolution adopted by Council on 12 September 1986. The entire Resolution now reads as follows:

A) that part-time faculty teaching in the Faculty of Arts and Science be granted two seats on the Arts and Science Faculty Council, said members to serve a one-year term and to be elected by the part-time faculty teaching in Arts and Science.

B) that all part-time faculty be eligible and that the election be managed by the Arts and Science Faculty Council through a special elections committee composed of three part-time faculty members elected by Council.

It was noted that members external to the University would sometimes be representing the part-time constituency as part-time contracts were for 8 or 10 months rather than a full academic year. The point was acknowledged but since Senate had not seen a problem with this, the matter was not pursued. Vote: Carried.

9. Curriculum Changes: M.A. in Public Policy and Public Administration (ASFC 86-10-D1): Addendum to Report 53G-Graduate Curriculum Course Changes - 1987-88)

Corrections to the document were noted: Page 1, 5th line from bottom:

POLI 697 is 3 credits rather than 6; page 2, 1(v) and (vi): POLI 697 is 3 credits, and POLI 699 is 6 credits; page 3, 1(v) and (vi): reverse the credit value; and page 3, 1(vii): POLI 691 should read 693; page 4, 1(v): POLI 699 should be 697, General Comprehensive Examination.

- 86-10-5 It was moved and seconded (Dicks/Chorney) to approve all modifications of the M.A. in Public Policy and Public Administration in options A, B, and C. Vote: Carried.

10. Academic Planning - Discussion Document (ASFC 86-10-D2)

Council moved into the Committee of the whole for discussion of the amendments to the document.

A statement from Liberal Arts College which outlined deficiencies in the document and urged the administration to delay formal approval of the document was circulated.

G. Decarie had sent a memo dated November 26, 1986 to Council members.

K. Mukherji distributed an article, "Some Views From

Beneath the Top: A Commentary on NSERC Grant Selection Policies and Procedures" (Geoscience Canada Volume 12, Number 1, 1985) dealing with the funding and determination of excellence.

Discussion

The Dean said a number of people had suggested the document should begin with a statement of principles and that while this could be done, he suggested that the debate concentrate on other aspects of the document.

It was suggested that establishing principles and short-term working guidelines was necessary but that judgment criteria should not be set too early for the criteria would then dictate what could be done. It was feared that the needs of measurement and evaluation might become more important than the functions of learning. The criteria were seen as qualitative statements; some were seen to have a catch-22 aspect to them. Another member remarked that although this document was more specific, the wording remained largely unchanged and the issues therefore still lacked clarity.

A major part of the discussion revolved around the fact that the Faculty's commitment to teaching and the fact that this was done very well was not stated. While the overall principle of building to strengths was said to have emerged from the departmental reports, the Faculty as a whole did not have a history of strength in research or in graduate studies but in teaching.

It was also suggested that Council was perhaps examining too closely statements that were meant to be general guidelines rather than absolute choices, and that perhaps it should be decided whether or not criteria for planning were to set up at all.

Another member worried that 'guidelines' could be too easily accepted as 'principles' and wondered what the result was likely to be if general guidelines excluded the idea of teaching excellence. Teaching seemed to be neglected in favour of research as a goal, not only in this document but by the Rector as well, in recent statements to The Gazette. It was suggested that neither area should be sacrificed and that a statement to this effect should be added to the document.

The Dean noted that the departmental reports had not placed great emphasis on teaching and he thought that this had possibly been taken as a given, by departments and by himself and the Vice-Deans when the original questions to chairs were formulated.

One member emphasized the necessity to start with strengths when dealing with evaluations of and justifications for programs, and noted that the document should have a section on how students entered the system- "encadrement." (e.g. the quality of the advisory structures; the amount of recruitment and advising). The point could be added under strength of programme over time.

Another member pointed out that the number of our students pursuing graduate studies elsewhere is not necessarily an indication that a department is excellent. Student advising was seen to be weak in many areas and he saw a need for more emphasis on general undergraduate education.

It was noted that although the Faculty could establish general descriptive principles, departments had the task of stating what they were about, their areas of competence, individually and collectively, and where they fit into the principles. Only when this had been done would an evaluation of strengths and weaknesses be possible.

Although some felt it was difficult to see how, for the moment, the suggestions could be assembled into a coherent statement of a Faculty ethos, they felt the administration had served notice that planning would be done, and had invited departments to participate and establish priorities; indeed, it was incumbent upon departments to participate. It was suggested that a faculty committee could be struck to bring a view of faculty priorities to bear upon the document.

The Dean was asked to state the ultimate goal of the discussion and the document. He replied that he found the varying viewpoints instructive and that it was important to discuss the issue. He felt a formal motion would not be useful at this point and he suggested that a statement of principles could be drawn up and brought to Council. He thought that if agreement could be reached on the principles stated, the planning process could be worked around these principles. He repeated that he still saw the document as having a great deal of flexibility. The 5-year plans were drawn up bearing in mind that the Faculty is highly tenured with little mobility. Resource

implications were omitted as much as possible in order to arrive at a list of academic priorities into which resources could be fit (i.e. building strengths). The Dean thought Council could perhaps reach agreement on principles rather than criteria.

Council returned to formal session.

11. Next Meeting

February 6, 1987. The January meeting has been cancelled.

12. Adjournment

86-1-6 It was moved and seconded (Decarie/Newsham) that Council adjourn. Merry Christmas and a Happy Holiday to all.